

all



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/986,555	11/09/2001	Fernando Ortega Rodriguez	Q66984	5908

23373 7590 07/06/2007
 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
 SUITE 800
 WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

SHEPARD, JUSTIN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/06/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/986,555	Applicant(s) ORTEGA RODRIGUEZ ET AL.	
Examiner Justin E. Shepard	Art Unit 2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-8, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adiwoso in view of Schiff.

Referring to claim 1, Adiwoso discloses an integrated multispot satellite communication system in a multimedia broadcasting network with a return channel (figure 1; column 3, lines 35-48), comprising:

a satellite that receives a multimedia broadcast signal from a provider and transmits said multimedia broadcast signal to a user in response to a request from said user (column 3, lines 43-48);

a network controller that receives different return channels from said user and said provider, via said satellite (column 4, lines 30-32, 36-38, and 48-53), wherein a signaling part of said multimedia broadcast signal is addressed from said provider to said network controller (column 9, lines 57-65).

Art Unit: 2623

Adiwoso does not disclose a system with common means of burst synchronization such that the transmission rate in a downlink direction from the satellite is a whole multiple of a clock reference of said network.

In an analogous art, Schiff teaches a system with common means of burst synchronization (column 7, lines 18-23) such that the transmission rate in a downlink direction from the satellite is a whole multiple of a clock reference of said network (column 4, lines 65-67; figure 5; Note: The I Frame shown in figure 5 is interpreted as being the period of the downlink transmission. With this information one can see that 3 sets of information are sent within the downlink period. As the applicant has noted the transfer rate is equal to the amount of data sent divided by the period ($N_d/T_{df} = R_{td}$). Therefore the rate would be equal, in this case, to 3 times the frequency (where frequency is equal to $1/T_{df}$).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the synchronization method taught by Schiff to the system disclosed by Adiwoso. The motivation would have been to enable multiple users to transmit upstream to the satellite on the same frequency, thereby allowing for more efficient usage of bandwidth while insuring proper synchronization (Schiff: column 3, lines 1-5).

Claim 5 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 1.

Referring to claim 2, Adiwoso does not disclose a system according to claim 1, wherein said satellite is configured to generate said network clock reference.

In an analogous art, Schiff teaches a system according to claim 1, wherein said satellite is configured to generate said network clock reference (column 5, lines 27-31).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the synchronization method taught by Schiff to the system disclosed by Adiwoso. The motivation would have been to enable multiple users to transmit upstream to the satellite on the same frequency (Schiff: column 3, lines 1-5).

Claim 6 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 2.

Referring to claim 3, Adiwoso does not disclose a system according to claim 2, further comprising a multiplexer.

In an analogous art, Schiff teaches a system according to claim 2, further comprising a multiplexer (figure 3).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the synchronization method taught by Schiff to the system disclosed by Adiwoso. The motivation would have been to enable multiple users to transmit upstream to the satellite on the same frequency (Schiff: column 3, lines 1-5).

Referring to claim 4, Adiwoso does not disclose a system according to claim 3, characterized in that said multiplexer inserts in a synchronous manner different uplink channels from the service provider and the user into a downlink signal, wherein a period of the downlink frame.

In an analogous art, Schiff teaches a system according to claim 3, characterized in that said multiplexer inserts in a synchronous manner different uplink channels from the service provider and the user into a downlink signal (column 4, lines 19-25), wherein a period of the downlink frame (column 3, lines 55-58; Note: frame and period are viewed as being interchangeable) is equal to a period of the uplink frame (column 3, lines 1-5).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the synchronization method taught by Schiff to the system disclosed by Adiwoso. The motivation would have been to enable multiple users to transmit upstream to the satellite on the same frequency (Schiff: column 3, lines 1-5).

Claim 7 is rejected on the same grounds as claims 3 and 4.

Claim 8 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 4.

Referring to claim 17, Adiwoso discloses a system of claim 1, wherein said request from said user comprises a request for video on demand service (column 3, lines 43-48).

Claim 18 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 17.

2. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adiwoso in view of Schiff as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Hreha.

Art Unit: 2623

Referring to claim 9, Adiwoso and Schiff do not disclose a system of claim 1, wherein said system is configured to communicate in accordance with digital video broadcasting return channel system.

In an analogous art, Hreha teaches a system of claim 1, wherein said system is configured to communicate in accordance with digital video broadcasting return channel system (column 3, lines 34-42).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the DVB-RC standard taught by Hreha in the system disclosed by Adiwoso and Schiff. The motivation would have been to use a public signaling standard (column 3, lines 34-42).

Claim 10 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 9.

3. Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adiwoso in view of Schiff as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Setoyama.

Referring to claim 11, Adiwoso and Schiff do not disclose a system of claim 1, wherein said downlink direction transmission rate is one of 54 Mbit/s, 81 Mbit/s and 108 Mbit/s.

In an analogous art, Setoyama teaches a system of claim 1, wherein said downlink direction transmission rate is one of 54 Mbit/s (column 1, lines 39-41 and 46-51), 81 Mbit/s and 108 Mbit/s.

Art Unit: 2623

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the 54 Mbit/s transmission rate taught by Setoyama in the system disclosed by Adiwoso and Schiff. The motivation would have been to fit more data into the stream.

Claim 12 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 11.

Referring to claim 13, Adiwoso and Schiff do not disclose a system of claim 1, wherein a bandwidth of a transmitter onboard said satellite is a multiple of 27 MHz.

In an analogous art, Setoyama teaches a system of claim 1, wherein a bandwidth of a transmitter onboard said satellite is a multiple of 27 MHz (column 1, lines 39-41 and 46-51).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the 27 MHz bandwidth taught by Setoyama in the system disclosed by Adiwoso and Schiff. The motivation would have been to fit more data into the stream.

Claim 14 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 13.

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adiwoso in view of Schiff as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Sharon.

Referring to claim 15, Adiwoso discloses a system of claim 1, further comprising: wherein said network controller performs control operations and verifies at least one of an identity and a profile of said user (column 4, lines 48-53; column 9, lines 57-65).

Art Unit: 2623

Adiwoso and Schiff do not disclose a system with a regenerator, positioned on said satellite, that performs multiplexing and at least one of cross-connecting and broadcasting channels to different coverage zones.

In an analogous art, Sharon teaches a system with a regenerator, positioned on said satellite, that performs multiplexing and at least one of cross-connecting and broadcasting channels to different coverage zones (column 4, lines 31-39).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the repeater for adding zone coverage taught by Sharon to the system disclosed by Adiwoso and Schiff. The motivation would have been to enable coverage of multiple zones (or areas) thereby decreasing the need to launch a satellite for each area, therefore saving money (Adiwoso: figure 2; column 6, lines 20-30).

Claim 16 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 15.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2623

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin E. Shepard whose telephone number is (571) 272-5967. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JS


SCOTT E. BELIVEAU
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER